

RFMUD RE-STUDY GOALS, PRINCIPALS, ISSUES

DRAFT 12/3/15

GOALS

Original Goals of RFMUD Program: Words taken directly from 1999 “Final Order”

- Protect wetlands, wildlife and habitat from unrestrained growth
- Protect agricultural land from premature conversion to other uses
- Direct growth potential to appropriate locations
- Utilize creative land use planning techniques
 - *Including new towns, satellite communities, clustering, mixed use, open space*

Goals used by RF Area Oversight Comm and BCC 1999- 2005

- Comp Plan, LDC and subsequent “bonus” amendments

Restudy Goals, RFMUD:

- Retain original goals
- Improve the TDR credit system
 - Achieve proper balance of credits (optimize supply and demand)
 - Incentivize preservation and stewardship
 - Ensure reasonable demand for credits in R’g areas
- Identify agencies or entities for long term ownership and maintenance
- Review and improve development uses, reg’s and standards, based on:
 - Community values
 - Sustainability
 - Economic development
 - Consistency with area needs, other sub-area needs and County policies
 - Policies, e.g., mobility, watershed, fiscal, infrastructure, housing, etc.

PRINCIPLES

- Build on existing foundation:
 - TDR currency (not RLSA type complexity); basic structure maintained
 - No consideration of boundary changes in S'g or R'g classification
 - Consider broad area differences, public benefits in Sending Lands

- Consider issues and opportunities in context of all Restudy areas:
 - Land uses
 - Transportation and mobility
 - Watershed and aquifer recharge
 - Economic development
 - Sustainable practices
 - Community with character

- Efficiency:
 - Incorporate and utilize completed studies (ex. Master Mobility Study) or ongoing public policy direction from BCC (ex. Fiscal analysis)
 - Leverage community talent and effort (ex. RF Coalition; community outreach, NGOs and other public agencies)
 - Extend public meetings no longer than necessary
 - Structure Pub meetings so that topics will be known in advance

- Encourage simplicity for Sending land conversion
 - County administration
 - Conveyance simplicity; minimize costs if possible

- Public participation: High Value
 - As stated in Final Order: “Hallmark of the planning effort”
 - Oversight Committee will guide
 - Public meetings with stakeholders (civic and HO associations; state agencies, enviro and business groups); notes, agendas, comments available to all
 - Interactive website, surveys and other outreach

- LDC issues will be considered along with GMP provisions
 - Where complexity does not hinder GMP process
 - Ideally, LDC changes will track the “adoption” phase of the GMP amendments

- Incentives should be preferred to prohibitions or mandates where possible

ISSUES

Sending Land:

- Conveyance TDR Credits- Availability:
 - North Belle Meade
 - South Belle Meade
- Who might be the donee for NBM conveyance? Alternatives?
- How can Watershed Planning coordinate with TDR Conveyance and planning?
- How can Restoration and Maintenance credits be best achieved?
- Should larger tracts enjoy a bonus for severance?
- If more credits are assigned to certain S locations, what equity for past severance or conveyance?

Credit System:

- Calculate the number of credits available (to be generated) under present Sending area conditions, state assumptions, provide most, least and probable forecasts
- Calculate the number of credits needed (current standards) in Receiving areas, state assumptions, probable forecasts
- Analysis of average size and top 10 owners of sending lands per S area
- Calculate the number of credits already in the system, redeemed and not redeemed
- If additional credits are needed, what alternatives are best; recalculate after Receiving analysis
- Confirm reasonable price points will result; recalculate after Receiving analysis
- Should a TDR bank be created?
- Minimum sales price for any TDR?
- Eliminate 1 mile boundary in Residential Fringe context?
- Eliminate proportional use of TDRs vis-a-vis inherent base density?

Receiving Land:

- Identify desired non-residential uses; TDR requirements
- Visioning: what mix of economic diversification? (employment, economic development, service, retail)
- Identify smart growth density and requirements
- Can the CRD model (RLSA) be considered? What contexts?
- Review Rural Village requirements; opportunities for improvement
- Where should standards allow greater flexibility?
- When should community allow development “by right” (density, SDP/plat)?
- What incentives can be offered to encourage smart growth designs?
- What baseline design standards should apply?
- Can Hearing Examiner play a role in deviation process?
- Placement: GMP or LDC?
- What are the economics of public utility provisions for R’g locations?
- Discuss roadway needs in context of RFMUS, GGE, RLSA
- Establish infrastructure needs from development: school sites, emergency services, etc.

Other:

- Should re-assessment occur on a regular basis?
- Coordinate with parallel County-wide issues
 - Fiscal neutrality
 - AH/WFH/GAP
 - LRTP
 - Sidewalk/ bike path standards
 - Oil exploration and Extraction
 - Economic development programs